

1 **KINGSLEY & KINGSLEY, APC**
2 **GEORGE R. KINGSLEY, ESQ. SBN-38022**
3 **ERIC B. KINGSLEY, ESQ. SBN-185123**
4 *eric@kingsleykingsley.com*
5 **16133 VENTURA BL., SUITE 1200**
6 **ENCINO, CA 91436**
7 **(818) 990-8300, FAX (818) 990-2903**

8 **CHARLES JOSEPH, ESQ. FED BAR #CJ-9442**
9 **JOSEPH & HERZFELD LLP**
10 **233 BROADWAY, 5TH FLOOR**
11 **NEW YORK, NY 10279**
12 **(212) 688-5640; FAX (212) 688-2548**
13 **Seeking Admission Pro Hac Vice**

14 **MATTHEW D. BRINCKERHOFF ESQ. FED BAR #**
15 **EMERY CELLI BRINCKERHOFF & ABADY LLP**
16 **75 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA, 20th FLOOR**
17 **NEW YORK, NY 10019**
18 **(212) 763-5000; FAX (212) 763-5001**
19 **Seeking Admission Pro Hac Vice**

20 **Attorneys for Plaintiffs**

21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, SAN JOSE DIVISION

18	PHILIP M. CONTRERAS, on)	CASE NO.: CV 09-3405-JF
19	behalf of himself and all others)	
20	similarly situated,)	STIPULATION TO STAY ACTION
21)	AND ORDER
22	Plaintiffs,)	
23)	
24	v.)	
25)	
26	PFIZER INC., a Delaware)	
27	corporation, doing business in)	
28	California as PFIZER PRODUCTS,)	
	INC.; and DOES 1 to 50, Inclusive,)	
)	
	Defendants.)	
	_____)	

1 **THE PARTIES HEREBY STIPULATE AS FOLLOWS:**

2 **PLEASE TAKE NOTICE** that all parties desire to stay the proceedings in
 3 this action pending the outcome of three appeals that directly implicate the central
 4 issue in this case, i.e., whether pharmaceutical sales representatives are properly
 5 classified as exempt from Cal. Labor Code overtime requirements under either the
 6 outside sales or administrative exemptions. *See D'Este v. Bayer*, 07-56577, *Barnick*
 7 *v. Wyeth*, 07-56684, *Menes v. Roche*, 08-55286 (consolidated 9th Circuit appeals); *In*
 8 *Re Novartis Wage and Hour Litigation*, No. 09-0437 (2nd Cir.). A stay of this action
 9 pending a decision concerning the applicability of the outside sales and/or
 10 administrative exemptions under California and federal law will promote efficiency
 11 and conserve the resources of the court and the parties.

12 On February 11, 2009, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals heard oral argument
 13 in the consolidated cases of *Menes v. Roche*, 08-55286, *D'Este v. Bayer*, 07-56577,
 14 and *Barnick v. Wyeth*, 07-56684. In all three appeals, the district courts had awarded
 15 summary judgment to defendants based on the outside sales exemption under
 16 California law.

17 On May 5, 2009, the Ninth Circuit certified two questions to the California
 18 Supreme Court, addressing both the outside sales and the administrative exemptions
 19 as applied to pharmaceutical representatives. On June 10, 2009, the California
 20 Supreme Court denied the Ninth Circuit's request. On July 15, 2009, the Ninth
 21 Circuit entered an order withdrawing *Menes v. Roche*, 08-55286, *D'Este v. Bayer*, 07-
 22 56577, and *Barnick v. Wyeth*, 07-56684 from submission pending issuance of the
 23 mandate in *Harris v. Superior Court*, No. 515655, review granted by 171 P.3d 545
 24 (Cal. 2007). The consolidated cases will be resubmitted to the Ninth Circuit within
 25 twenty days of the California Supreme Court's decision in *Harris v. Superior Court*.
 26
 27
 28

1 On July 6, 2010, the Second Circuit Court of Appeals issued an opinion in *In*
 2 *Re Novartis Wage and Hour Litigation*, No. 09-0437 (2nd Cir.), 611 F.3d 141 (2010).
 3 This case involves the applicability of the outside sales exemption and the
 4 administrative exemption to pharmaceutical representatives under the Fair Labor and
 5 Standards Act (“FLSA”), New York state law, and California state law. The Ninth
 6 Circuit looking at an issue of federal law recently ruled that sales exemption applied
 7 to pharmaceutical sales reps *Christopher v. Smith Kline & Beecham* (9th Cir. 2011)
 8 635 F.3d 383. Plaintiff are in the process of filing a writ of certiorari to the United
 9 States Supreme Court.

10 The Second Circuit held that the pharmaceutical representatives were not
 11 exempt under the outside sales exemption or the administrative exemption. The bulk
 12 of the Court’s analysis relied on the exemptions under the FLSA. However, the
 13 Second Circuit went on to note that the overtime wage requirements of “New York
 14 law and California law are not meaningfully different from the requirements of the
 15 FLSA.” *In re Novartis Wage & Hour Litigation.*, 09-0437-CV, 2010 WL 2667337
 16 *15 (2d Cir. July 6, 2010). The defendant filed a Petition for Review to the United
 17 States Supreme Court, which was denied on February 28, 2011. See *Novartis*
 18 *Pharmaceuticals Corp. v. Lopes*, 131 S.Ct. 1568 (2011).

19 The decision in *In re Novartis Wage & Hour Litigation*, is obviously not
 20 binding on this Court. However, in the interest of providing this Court with a full
 21 status report of the state of the law regarding the core issues in this case, Plaintiff felt
 22 it was necessary to provide the Court with this information.

23 Other federal district courts have stayed similar cases concerning the
 24 classification of pharmaceutical sales representatives pending appeals in related
 25 actions. See *Silverman v. GlaxoSmithKline PLC*, 06 cv 7272 DSF (C.D. Cal. Dec. 17,
 26 2008) [Dkt. No. 188]; *Thorpe v. Abbott Laboratories, Inc.*, 5:07-cv-05672 RMW
 27

1 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 5, 2009) [Dkt. No. 54]. *Brody v. Astrazeneca Pharmaceuticals, LP*,
2 08-56120 (9th Cir. Mar. 3, 2009). Moreover, neither party would be prejudiced by a
3 stay in this action.

4 Wherefore, the parties respectfully request that the Court approve this
5 stipulation for a Stay of Proceedings, and continue the Status Conference set for
6 August 19, 2011, pending the resolution of one or both of the aforementioned
7 appeals.

8 **IT IS SO STIPULATED**

9
10 DATED: August 12, 2011

11 KINGSLEY & KINGSLEY, APC

12
13 By: /s/ Eric B. Kingsley
ERIC B. KINGSLEY
14 Attorney for Plaintiff

15
16 DATED: August 12, 2011

17 LITTLER MENDELSON

18
19 By: /s/ Kimberly J. Gost
PHILIP A. SIMPKINS
20 KIMBERLY J. GOST
21 (Admitted *pro hac vice*)
22 Attorneys for Defendants

23 IT IS SO ORDERED. The status conference is continued to 2/24/12.

24 DATED: 8/16/11



JEREMY FOGEL
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE